

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report

Case Number:

1000-0487

Case Title:

Pacific Steel and Recycling

Reporting Office:

Seattle, WA, Area Office

Subject of Report:

20160222 Phone Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Clean Harbors Environmental

Activity Date:

February 17, 2016

Reporting Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent

25-FEB-2016, Signed by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Approving Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

29-FEB-2016, Approved by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

SYNOPSIS

On February 22, 2016, SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conducted a phone interview (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Director of Field Services for Clean Harbors Environmental, regarding his knowledge of the Pacific Steel and Recycling release of chlorine gas on August 12, 2015.

DETAILS

On February 22, 2016, I conducted a phone interview (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Director of Field Services for Clean Harbors Environmental, regarding his knowledge of the Pacific Steel and Recycling release of chlorine gas on August 12, 2015. After being notified of the identity of the interviewing agent and the nature of the interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in substance, provided the following information:

After the chemical release on August 12, 2015, Clean Harbors Environmental (CHE) was contracted by Pacific Steel and Recycling (PSR) to clean up and decontaminate the facility. During the decontamination process he was approached by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of PSR regarding some of the personal items left behind by PSR employees during the chemical release.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) explained that several families of the PSR victims wanted to recover items such as wallets, keys and clothes belonging to the PSR employees who were evacuated from the PSR facility or hospitalized as a result of the chemical release. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) specifically mentioned that family members of one the hospitalized PSR employees were looking for his "lunch pail" which remained on the PSR facility after the chemical release. According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) this family had requested the lunch pail repeatedly.

As part of the normal procedures, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of CHE was assigned the detail of recovering the aforementioned lunch pail. During the recovery of the lunch pail, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) discovered a package of synthetic urine inside of the lunch pail.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) turned the lunch pail and synthetic urine over to managers of CHE who were at the PSR facility. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) contacted (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and handed over the requested lunch pail and synthetic urine package, after the decontamination process was complete. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) appeared to be shocked at the presence of the synthetic urine package and explained that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) would "take it from there."

He completed a chain of custody form regarding the lunch pail and synthetic urine package and turned over the items to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). He did not have a lot of conversation with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) regarding the synthetic urine.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

1000-0487

He did not have further conversations with PSR management regarding the synthetic urine, but met with the owner and CEO of PSR, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and possibly (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) at a later date. The CEO (could not recall the actual name) appeared to be distraught over the chemical release.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.